

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 17, 18, and 24-32 have been canceled, without prejudice to or disclaimer of subject matter contained therein, and new claims 33-43 have been added. Support for new claim 33 can be found, for example, at page 3, lines 21-24, of the present application. Support for new claim 34 can be found, for example, at page 3, lines 6-8, of the present application and canceled claim 24. Support for new claims 35-40 can be found in canceled claims 26-31. Support for new claim 41 can be found in canceled claim 19. Support for new claims 42 and 43 can be found in canceled claims 25 and 32, respectively. No new matter has been added. Favorable consideration and allowance are respectfully requested for pending claims 19-23 and 33-43 in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Without conceding in the propriety of the Restriction Requirement, and merely to expedite prosecute of the present application, Applicants hereby elect Group II, claims 19-23, drawn to an article. New claim 34 is directed to a process of using the article (*i.e.*, an antifogging article). New claim 41, which is directed to a process for producing the article (*i.e.*, an antifogging article), contains all the limitations of claim 19. Claims 42 and 43 are dependent, or ultimately dependent, upon claim 41. Claims 34 and 41-43 should be considered along with claims 19-23. See MPEP § 821.04(b).

The rejection of claims 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over JP-2001192242 ("Funadokoro") in view of JP-11158648 ("Nakamura") is respectfully traversed.

Funadokoro discloses a laminated multi-layer window structure composed of a polycarbonate board, a urethane film, a first inorganic glass plate, an air layer and a second inorganic glass plate. The thickness of the polycarbonate board is controlled to  $\leq 2.5$  mm, and the thickness of the first inorganic glass plate is adjusted to  $\geq 3$  to  $\leq 5$  mm. The second inorganic glass plate is of thermally strengthened glass, and the thickness is controlled to  $\geq 4$  to  $\leq 6$  mm. (Abstract).

The Office Action acknowledges that Funadokoro does not disclose a primer layer containing a hydrolysis product of a hydrolysable silicon compound having an alkylene group and a hydrolysis product of a hydrolysable zirconium compound

or hydrolysable titanium compound, as recited in independent claims 19 and 41. Accordingly, the Office Action cites Nakamura for disclosure of a mixture of hydrolysis compounds containing silicon and titanium. The Office Action acknowledges that Nakamura does not disclose the ratio of the hydrolysable silicon and titanium present in the mixture.

In Nakamura, the coating liquid for forming the first layer (primer layer) in Experiment No. 11 of Example 2 (see Table 2) contains 3% of A-1 liquid (*i.e.*, tetrahydroxysilane alcohol solution) and 3% of A-2 liquid (tetrahydroxytitanium alcohol solution). In the A-1 liquid, the silicon concentration is **0.88%** (*i.e.*,  $3\% \times (28.1/96.1)$ , where 28.1 is atomic weight of Si, and 96.1 is molecular weight of tetrahydroxysilane  $\text{Si}(\text{OH})_4$ ). In the A-2 liquid, the titanium concentration is **1.24%** (*i.e.*,  $3\% \times (47.9/115.9)$ , where 47.9 is atomic weight of titanium, and 115.9 is molecular weight of tetrahydroxytitanium  $\text{Ti}(\text{OH})_4$ ). Therefore, according to Experiment No. 11 of Example 2 of Nakamura, titanium contained in the primer layer is in an amount by weight ratio of **1.41** (*i.e.*,  $1.24/0.88$ ) times that of silicon contained in the primer layer. This value is far greater than the presently claimed amount by weight of 0.0005 times to 0.0045 times, as recited in independent claims 19 and 41.

The presently claimed weight ratios of independent claims 19 and 41 have criticality. In particular, criticality of the presently claimed amount of zirconium by weight ratio of 0.0002 times to 0.0025 times that of silicon is clearly supported by Example 2 (0.0002 times) and Example 3 (0.002 times), showing good test results, and by Comparative Example 2 (0.0001 times) and Comparative Example 3 (0.003 times), showing inferior test results. Furthermore, criticality of the presently claimed amount of titanium by weight ratio of 0.0005 times to 0.0045 times that of silicon is clearly supported by Example 7 (0.0005 times) and Example 8 (0.0044 times), showing good test results, and by Comparative Example 3 (0.0004 times) and Comparative Example 5 (0.005 times), showing inferior test results. Such criticality is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, the application is respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance, and prompt, favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the examination of the application.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 038788.57734US).

Respectfully submitted,

July 13, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. D. Evans  
Registration No. 26,269  
Asaf Batelman  
Registration No. 52,600

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JDE/AB (doc. # 8425470)